arXiv:1609.06674v2 [math.NA] 28 Sep 2016

EFFICIENT METHODS FOR THE ESTIMATION OF HOMOGENIZED COEFFICIENTS

JEAN-CHRISTOPHE MOURRAT

Abstract. We introduce new methods to compute the homogenized coefficients of divergence-form operators with random coefficients. We focus on a discrete-space setting with i.i.d. coefficients, and investigate algorithms which take a sample of the random coefficient field as input. In order to produce an approximation of the homogenized coefficients at precision δ, any algorithm must perform at least of the order of δ^{-2} operations. We present an algorithm that essentially achieves this lower bound, up to logarithmic factors. This improves upon the previously best known method by a factor of $\delta^{-1/d}$. An additional new feature is that the method is cumulative: all computations done at a coarse precision remain useful if the estimate needs to be refined.

1. Introduction

Let $-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}(x)\nabla$ be a divergence-form operator with random coefficients. If the law of the matrix field $(\mathbf{a}(x))$ is stationary and ergodic, then the operator homogenizes over large scales to an operator with constant, deterministic coefficients $-\nabla \cdot \bar{\mathbf{a}}\nabla$. The goal of this paper is to introduce and study new numerical methods to estimate the homogenized matrix $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$. We can formalize this task as follows.

Problem. *Find an algorithm that, given $\delta > 0$ and a realization of the random coefficient field $(\mathbf{a}(x))$, outputs a matrix $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\bar{\mathbf{a}} - \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta|^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \delta. \tag{1.1}$$

In (1.1), we chose to measure the quality of the approximation $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta$ in an L^2 sense for definiteness, but other choices (e.g. convergence in probability, or higher moments) are equally valid, and in fact would only marginally alter the results presented here. The point is that $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta$ should typically be within δ or less from $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$.

Naturally, the real question is to find an *efficient* algorithm. We focus on a discrete-space setting, and assume throughout that the coefficients are uniformly elliptic and i.i.d. In order to measure computational effort, we use a slightly loosely defined notion of "elementary" operation: any memory access, boolean operation, floating point addition or multiplication counts as one operation. We first give a lower bound on the number of operations any algorithm must use.

Date: September 29, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B27.

Key words and phrases. stochastic homogenization, homogenized coefficients.

Proposition 1.1. *No algorithm can output an approximation $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta$ of $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$ in the sense of (1.1) within $o(\delta^{-2})$ operations.*

The main result of this paper is that the lower bound of the order of δ^{-2} operations can essentially be achieved.

Theorem 1. *For some $k(d) < \infty$, the algorithm described in Proposition 4.3 outputs an approximation $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta$ of $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$ in the sense of (1.1) in $O(\delta^{-2}\log^k \delta^{-1})$ operations.*

To the best of my knowledge, the new method introduced here improves on the previously best known method by a factor of $\delta^{-\frac{1}{d}}$. The previous best method for computing $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$ at precision δ requires to compute an approximation of the corrector in a box of side length $\delta^{-\frac{1}{d}}$ (up to logarithms), and to repeat this computation independently δ^{-1} times — see [19, Section 3.3.4] for details. The computation of the approximate corrector on such a box amounts to the resolution of a linear system with δ^{-1} unknowns and a condition number of the order of $\delta^{-\frac{2}{d}}$. Solving such a problem at precision δ using the conjugate gradient method requires $\delta^{-\left(1+\frac{1}{d}\right)}$ operations (see e.g. [42, Theorem 4.12]). This computation being repeated δ^{-1} times, the older method requires of the order of $\delta^{-\left(2+\frac{1}{d}\right)}$ operations, up to logarithmic factors.

Recently, the quantitative understanding of the homogenization of divergence-form equations with random coefficients has progressed trememdously [25, 26, 23, 37, 10, 24, 9, 6, 7, 27]. The philosophy of [6, 7, 8] is to progressively "renormalize" or "coarsen the equation", and bring the coarsened coefficient field into a regime of small ellipticity contrast. Once in this regime, energy-type quantities become essentially additive, up to an error of the order of the *square* of the typical fluctuations of the coarsened field. In this regime, it therefore becomes elementary to compute the homogenized coefficients as simple averages, up to a very small error.

In order to translate this idea into efficient algorithms, the main task is to find a computationally tractable way to "coarsen the equation". In other words, we look for a computationally-friendly renormalization group procedure. Before doing so, let us recall that if $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a fixed unit vector and ϕ is the corrector in the direction of ξ, that is, the unique sublinear solution to

$$-D\cdot\mathbf{a}(\xi+D\phi)=0, \tag{1.2}$$

(see Section 2 for the notation), then the homogenized matrix $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$ is such that

$$\xi\cdot\bar{\mathbf{a}}\xi=\mathbb{E}\left[(\xi+D\phi)\cdot\mathbf{a}(\xi+D\phi)\right]. \tag{1.3}$$

By the weak formulation of (1.2), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[D\phi\cdot\mathbf{a}(\xi+D\phi)\right]=0. \tag{1.4}$$

Expanding (1.3) therefore yields

$$\xi\cdot\bar{\mathbf{a}}\xi=\mathbb{E}[\xi\cdot\mathbf{a}\xi]-\mathbb{E}\left[D\phi\cdot\mathbf{a}D\phi\right]. \tag{1.5}$$

This formula displays very concretely that indeed, in the regime of small ellipticity contrast, say $1\le\mathbf{a}\le 1+\eta$ with $\eta>0$ small, the distance between the matrices $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{a}]$ scales like $O(\eta^2)$. There remains to find computable

ways to "coarsen the equation" and bring ourselves into the regime of small ellipticity contrast. We will describe several ways of doing so, but focus on using the parabolic equation in this introduction (cf. also [27]). Denoting by $u_t(\mathbf{a}) = u_t$ $(t \geq 0)$ the solution to

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \partial_t u = D \cdot \mathbf{a} D u \\ u(\mathbf{a}, 0) = D \cdot \mathbf{a} \xi, \end{array} \right. \tag{1.6}$$

we will see that

$$\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[D\phi \cdot \mathbf{a} D\phi \right] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E} \left[u_t^2 \right] \, \mathrm{d}t. \tag{1.7}$$

The integral on the right side of (1.7) realizes our aim to "progressively homogenize" the equation and face a correction term of the order of the square of the remaining field fluctuations. A simple separation of time scales allows to compute this integral efficiently. Indeed, for $t \lesssim 1$, the computation of

$$\int_t^{2t} u_s^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \tag{1.8}$$

for a given sample of the coefficient field requires $O(1)$ operations, which we can then average over $O(\delta^{-2})$ samples to get an approximation of the expectation. On the other hand, for t large, the computation of one sample is more demanding, but the value itself is so small that only a handful of samples need to be averaged in order to bring the standard deviation below δ.

We will describe the argument more precisely in the coming sections. For now, we only mention that in the paragraph above, we implicitly stated that the heat equation can be propagated over a unit amount of time in $O(1)$ operations per unit volume. In practice, we will not rely upon this questionable assertion, but rather introduce variants of the method for which the claim becomes valid, possibly up to a logarithmic factor. The main variant is based on iterations of the resolvent $(\mathrm{Id} - D \cdot \mathbf{a} D)^{-1}$.

As becomes apparent, the method introduced here is very simple to implement from scratch. It has the additional advantage of being cumulative: all computations performed for the approximation to $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$ at a given precision remain useful if the approximation needs to be refined. In contrast, in the older method, computations done for a coarse precision must be thrown away if greater precision is then desired.

The theoretical arguments are supplemented by numerical tests. The actual implementation takes full advantage of the discrete nature of the space, and uses yet another variant based on a discrete-time parabolic equation. This latter method may not generalize well to the continuous-space setting, but in the present case, reduces the number of operations by a logarithmic factor. The numerical results confirm the sharpness of the analysis.

As was said above, we assume throughout the paper that the coefficient field is uniformly elliptic and i.i.d., and we describe algorithms that perform well under these assumptions. In practice, it seems more appropriate to implement more "agnostic" algorithms, that would evaluate on the fly the behavior of the mean and variance of the integral in (1.8) as t varies, and adapt the numerical scheme accordingly. We will not discuss this possibility any further here.

It would be very interesting to implement these ideas for equations posed in a continuous space. In this case, we expect that the error analysis presented here remains unchanged. The complexity analysis would however have to also take into account the cost of the small-scale resolution of the equation, below the typical length scale of the fluctuations of the coefficient field. This problem is separate from the homogenization phenomenon, and is likely to come as the same multiplicative factor in the complexity analysis of any method.

Another interesting line of further research concerns the behavior of the effective conductivity of percolation clusters. We refer to [30, 35] for very nice surveys on this problem. The method presented here should allow for a much sharper numerical analysis of the effective conductivity as the percolation probability approaches criticality. Despite immense progress on the understanding of critical and near-critical percolation in two dimensions, it is still not known whether the effective conductivity behaves as a power law near criticality (let alone compute the exponent) in small dimensions. See however [32, 31, 16], as well as [11, 34, 12, 13] for very fine results in high dimensions.

We conclude this introduction by a brief review of related work. It was quickly realized that the resolution of cell problems or the computation of adapted finite-element base functions can display so-called "resonant errors" due to inapropriate boundary condition [28, 29, 44, 18]. Oversampling was first studied as a way to dampen the resonant error. A more powerful approach was then introduced in [15, 26, 39, 21], based on the introduction of a massive term that smoothly makes the faraway boundary condition irrelevant. The parabolic or elliptic problems considered here are faithful to this approach (see also [5]).

A different line of research focused on developing more efficient methods for computing homogenized coefficients of small random perturbations of a simpler, e.g. homogeneous, medium, in the spirit of earlier fundamental insights [38, 43]. A typical example is that of spherical inclusions randomly placed at a small volume fraction $p > 0$ in an otherwise constant medium. One looks for asymptotic formulas of the homogenized coefficients involving easily computable coefficients, in the regime $p \ll 1$. We refer to [33, 41, 14, 3, 4, 1, 2, 40, 17] for a mathematical analysis of the problem. Note that the seemingly simpler task of determining the value of the volume fraction p at precision δ from a sample of the coefficient field already requires of the order of δ^{-2} operations (the proof of the lower bound is a minor variant of the proof of Proposition 1.1).

Lastly, several techniques have been explored to reduce the size of the fluctuations of quantities of interest, typically by a constant multiplicative factor. We refer to [36] for a recent survey.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 lays down the notation and assumptions used throughout the paper. Section 3 presents two related methods based on the identity (1.7). The bulk of the section consists in justifying the error analysis of these methods. Included is also a loose discussion of the complexity of the methods. Section 4 then defines an alternative method based on iterated resolvents. The error analysis of this method can be deduced from the results of the previous section. The complexity analysis is then discussed rigorously, and completes the proof of Theorem 1. Section 5 introduces yet another variant of the method, based on discrete-time parabolic equations. We

do not delve into the necessary adaptations that would allow to extend the previous arguments to cover the rigorous error analysis of this method. Section 6 exposes the results of numerical experiments, which confirm the validity of Theorem 1. The code can be downloaded from the source files of the arXiv posting of this paper. Finally, Section 7 contains the proof of Proposition 1.1.

We assume throughout that floating point operations can be performed with perfect numerical precision. An examination of the arguments reveals that the upper bounds on the number of operations would only be degraded by logarithmic factors if we were to choose more realistic assumptions.

2. Notation and assumptions

We focus on the discrete space $\mathbb{Z}^d$, $d \geq 2$. We say that $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ are neighbors, and write $x \sim y$, if $|x-y| = 1$. This turns $\mathbb{Z}^d$ into a graph, and we denote by $\mathbb{B}$ the corresponding set of undirected edges. For a fixed ellipticity parameter $\Lambda \in (1, \infty)$, we let $\Omega = [1, \Lambda]^{\mathbb{B}}$ denote the set of coefficient fields, equipped with the product σ-algebra. We denote by $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{a}_e)_{e \in \mathbb{B}}$ the canonical random variable on Ω. We let $\mathbb{P}$ be a probability measure on Ω under which the random variables $(\mathbf{a}_e)_{e \in \mathbb{B}}$ are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.), and denote by $\mathbb{E}$ the associated expectation. Besides uniform ellipticity, this independence assumption is our main quantitative hypothesis. As a rule of thumb, every inequality derived in this paper requires this assumption, while every equality would actually hold under the weaker assumption of stationarity and ergodicity. The group $\mathbb{Z}^d$ acts on Ω by translations via

$$(\theta_x \mathbf{a})_e = \mathbf{a}_{x+e},$$

where $x+e$ denotes the edge e translated by the vector x. Let $(\mathbf{e}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_d)$ be the canonical basis of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. We may identify each vector $\mathbf{e}_i$ with the corresponding edge $\{0, \mathbf{e}_i\}$ when convenient. The discrete gradient ∇ acts on functions $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ according to

$$\nabla f(x) := \left(f(x+\mathbf{e}_1) - f(x), \ldots, f(x+\mathbf{e}_d) - f(x)\right),$$

while the discrete divergence acts on function $F = (F_1, \ldots, F_d) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$ via

$$\nabla \cdot F(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left(F_i(x) - F_i(x-\mathbf{e}_i)\right).$$

One can check that up to a minus sign, the gradient and divergence operators are formal adjoints of one another with respect to the counting measure on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. The operator of interest to us is defined by

$$L := -\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla,$$

where here we interpret $\mathbf{a}(x)$ as the diagnoal matrix $\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{a}_{x+\mathbf{e}_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{x+\mathbf{e}_d})$. More explicitly, for every $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$Lf(x) = \sum_{y \sim x} \mathbf{a}_{xy} \left(f(x) - f(y)\right).$$

It is useful to lift this operator to stationary functions on Ω. We first define the corresponding discrete gradient D, which acts on functions $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ via

$$Df(\mathbf{a}) := \left(f(\theta_{\mathbf{e}_1}\mathbf{a}) - f(\mathbf{a}), \ldots, f(\theta_{\mathbf{e}_d}\mathbf{a}) - f(\mathbf{a})\right),$$

and the discrete divergence, which acts on functions $F = (F_1, \ldots, F_d) : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$ via

$$D \cdot F(\mathbf{a}) := \sum_{i=1}^{d} \left(F_i(\mathbf{a}) - F_i(\theta_{-\mathbf{e}_i}\mathbf{a})\right).$$

One can verify that up to a minus sign, the gradient and divergence operators are formal adjoints of one another under the measure $\mathbb{P}$. The "lifted" (or stationary) operator is

$$\mathcal{L} := -D \cdot \mathbf{a} D,$$

where we understand here that $\mathbf{a} = \mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{e}_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{e}_d})$. In a more explicit form, for every $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{L}f(\mathbf{a}) = \sum_{z \sim 0} \mathbf{a}_{0z} \left(f(\mathbf{a}) - f(\theta_z \mathbf{a})\right).$$

The operator $\mathcal{L}$ is self-adjoint on $L^2(\Omega)$.

With each function $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, one can associate a stationary extension $\widetilde{f} : \Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\widetilde{f}(\mathbf{a}, x) := f(\theta_x \mathbf{a}).$$

Any function on $\Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^d$ that can be written in this way is said to be stationary. We will often abuse notation and write $f(x)$ instead of $\widetilde{f}(\mathbf{a}, x)$.

We let $L^2_{\mathrm{pot}}(\Omega)$ denote the closure in $L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)$ of the set of gradient fields $\{Df \,:\, f \in L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^d)\}$. Each element of $L^2_{\mathrm{pot}}(\Omega)$ can be realized as the gradient of a possibly non-stationary function $\Omega \times \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. Naturally, the gradient determines the function up to an additive constant. We will denote by Df any element of $L^2_{\mathrm{pot}}(\Omega)$, keeping in mind that f may be a non-stationary function. We fix once and for all a unit vector $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and define the corrector in the direction of ξ as the unique $D\phi \in L^2_{\mathrm{pot}}(\Omega)$ such that (1.2) holds. The equation (1.2) is interpreted in the weak sense of

$$\forall\, Df \in L^2_{\mathrm{pot}}(\Omega), \quad \mathbb{E}\left[Df \cdot \mathbf{a}\left(\xi + D\phi\right)\right] = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

The existence of $D\phi$ can be showed by considering first the approximate correctors $(\phi_\mu)_{\mu>0}$. For each $\mu > 0$, the approximate corrector $\phi_\mu \in L^2(\Omega)$ solves an equation with an additional massive term:

$$\mu\phi_\mu - D \cdot \mathbf{a}\left(\xi + D\phi_\mu\right) = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Classical testing arguments ensure that

$$D\phi_\mu \xrightarrow[\mu \to 0]{L^2(\Omega)} D\phi. \tag{2.3}$$

As is well-known, the discrete operator $-\nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}\nabla$ homogenizes to the continuous differential operator $-\nabla \cdot \bar{\mathbf{a}}\nabla$, where $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$ is the constant-in-space, deterministic matrix characterized by (1.3). The weak formulation (2.1) justifies (1.4), and therefore (1.5).

For concision, we denote the quantity on which we focus by

$$I := \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[\xi \cdot (\mathbf{a} - \bar{\mathbf{a}})\,\xi\right] = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[D\phi \cdot \mathbf{a}D\phi\right]. \tag{2.4}$$

3. Continuous-time parabolic equation

In this section, we show (1.7) and expose methods based on this identity that allow to compute I. We perform the error analysis of the methods precisely, but keep their complexity analysis slightly imprecise, in the spirit of the introduction. The latter will be taken up with more precision in the next section.

3.1. General identities.

Recall that we denote by $(u_t)_{t\geq 0}$ the unique bounded solution to (1.6). Since $\mathcal{L}$ is self-adjoint on $L^2(\Omega)$, it is clear that this function is well-defined as the image of the function

$$\mathfrak{d}(\mathbf{a}) := D \cdot \mathbf{a}\xi \tag{3.1}$$

by the semigroup $P_t := \exp(-t\mathcal{L})$. The following proposition justifies (1.7), and is key to the methods developped here.

Proposition 3.1. *We have*

$$I = \int_0^{+\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[u_t^2\right]\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Proof. Recall the definition of I in (2.4). By (2.3),

$$\mathbb{E}\left[D\phi \cdot \mathbf{a}D\phi\right] = \lim_{\mu\to 0} \mathbb{E}\left[D\phi_\mu \cdot \mathbf{a}D\phi\right]. \tag{3.2}$$

By the weak formulation (2.1) and integration by parts,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[D\phi_\mu \cdot \mathbf{a}D\phi\right] = -\mathbb{E}\left[D\phi_\mu \cdot \mathbf{a}\xi\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\phi_\mu\,\mathfrak{d}\right].$$

Moreover, we have

$$\phi_\mu = \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t}\,u_t\,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{3.3}$$

Indeed, since $\sup_t \mathbb{E}[u_t^2]$ is finite, the summability of this integral poses no problem, and moreover,

$$(-D\cdot\mathbf{a}D)\left(\int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t}\,u_t\,\mathrm{d}t\right) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t}\,\partial_t u_t\,\mathrm{d}t = u_0 - \mu\int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t}\,u_t\,\mathrm{d}t,$$

and we recall that $u_0 = \mathfrak{d}$. This justifies (3.3), and therefore that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\phi_\mu\,\mathfrak{d}\right] = \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t}\,\mathbb{E}[u_t\,\mathfrak{d}]\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Since $\mathcal{L}$ is self-adjoint, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[u_t\,\mathfrak{d}] = \mathbb{E}\left[(P_t\mathfrak{d})\,\mathfrak{d}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[(P_{t/2}P_{t/2}\mathfrak{d})\,\mathfrak{d}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[(P_{t/2}\mathfrak{d})^2\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[u_{t/2}^2\right].$$

We have thus shown

$$\mathbb{E}\left[D\phi_\mu \cdot \mathbf{a}D\phi\right] = \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t}\,\mathbb{E}\left[u_{t/2}^2\right]\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

Passing to the limit $\mu \to 0$ and changing variables $t/2 \mapsto t$ yields the result. □

3.2. **Basic algorithm.** So far, we have not used the independence assumption on the coefficient field. This will change with the next proposition, which describes a first concrete algorithm for the approximation of $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$, and estimates its precision. We will then refine this algorithm in several stages below to reduce its complexity. For convenience, we now assume that we are given a sequence $\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \mathbf{a}^{(2)}, \ldots$ of independent realizations of the random coefficient field. We write $u_t(\mathbf{a}^{(n)})$ for the solution to (1.6) associated with the coefficient field $\mathbf{a}^{(n)}$.

Proposition 3.2. *For each $\delta \in (0,1/2]$ and $t \in [0,\delta^{-2}]$, define*

$$N_\delta(t) := \lfloor \delta^{-2}(1 \vee t)^{-d} \rfloor \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}, \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$I_\delta := \int_0^{\delta^{-2/d}} \frac{1}{N_\delta(t)} \sum_{n=1}^{N_\delta(t)} \left(u_t\left(\mathbf{a}^{(n)}\right)\right)^2 \mathrm{d}t.$$

There exists $C(d,\Lambda) < \infty$ such that for every $\delta \in (0,1/2]$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(I_\delta - I\right)^2\right] \le C\delta^2 \log \delta^{-1}. \tag{3.5}$$

The key ingredient to prove this proposition is the following moment bound on u_t, which is borrowed from [23, Theorem 1].

Proposition 3.3 ([23])**.** *For each $p \in [1,\infty)$, there exists $C(d,\Lambda,p) < \infty$ such that for every $t \ge 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|u_t|^p\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \le C(1 \vee t)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}+\frac{1}{2}\right)}.$$

Proof of Proposition 3.2. We analyze the expectation and variance of I_δ separately. For the expectation,

$$\mathbb{E}[I_\delta] = \int_0^{\delta^{-2/d}} \mathbb{E}[u_t^2] \,\mathrm{d}t. \tag{3.6}$$

It therefore follows from Proposition 3.3 with $p = 2$ that

$$0 \le I - \mathbb{E}[I_\delta] \le \int_{\delta^{-2/d}}^{\infty} Ct^{-\left(\frac{d}{2}+1\right)} \,\mathrm{d}t \le C\delta. \tag{3.7}$$

We now turn to the analysis of the variance. For each $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $t \in [0,\delta^{-2/d}]$, setting

$$T_\delta(n) := \delta^{-\frac{2}{d}} n^{-\frac{1}{d}}, \tag{3.8}$$

we have

$$n \le N_\delta(t) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad t \le T_\delta(n). \tag{3.9}$$

We may thus rewrite I_δ as

$$I_\delta = \sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor \delta^{-2} \rfloor} \int_0^{T_\delta(n)} \frac{1}{N_\delta(t)} \left(u_t\left(\mathbf{a}^{(n)}\right)\right)^2 \mathrm{d}t. \tag{3.10}$$

By independence of the sequence $\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \mathbf{a}^{(2)}, \ldots$, we have

$$\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[I_\delta\right] = \sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor \delta^{-2} \rfloor} \mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[\int_0^{T_\delta(n)} \frac{1}{N_\delta(t)} \left(u_t\left(\mathbf{a}^{(n)}\right)\right)^2 \mathrm{d}t\right].$$

We bound each of these variances by the squared L^2 norm, and apply the integral triangle inequality:

$$\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[\int_0^{T_\delta(n)} \frac{1}{N_\delta(t)} \left(u_t\left(\mathbf{a}^{(n)}\right)\right)^2 \,\mathrm{d}t\right] \le \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^{T_\delta(n)} \frac{1}{N_\delta(t)} \left(u_t\left(\mathbf{a}^{(n)}\right)\right)^2 \,\mathrm{d}t\right)^2\right]$$
$$\le \left(\int_0^{T_\delta(n)} \frac{1}{N_\delta(t)} \mathbb{E}[u_t^4]^{\frac{1}{2}} \,\mathrm{d}t\right)^2.$$

By the definition of $N_\delta(t)$ and Proposition 3.3 with $p = 4$, the latter quantity is bounded by a constant times

$$\left(\int_0^{T_\delta(n)} \frac{1}{\delta^{-2}(1 \vee t)^{-d}} (1 \vee t)^{-(\frac{d}{2}+1)} \,\mathrm{d}t\right)^2 \le C\delta^4 (T_\delta(n))^d = C\delta^2 n^{-1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}[I_\delta] \le C \sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor \delta^{-2} \rfloor} \delta^2 n^{-1} \le C\delta^2 \log \delta^{-1},$$

which concludes the proof. □

3.3. **Complexity analysis.** At the present stage, we ask the reader to take a temporary leap of faith and "pretend" that propagating the heat equation over a unit amount of time requires $O(1)$ operations per site computed. We will make the discussion that follows rigorous in the next section, where we introduce a variant of the method that essentially jstifies this claim, up to logarithmic factors. With this caveat in mind, we want to convince the reader right away that one can compute I_δ in $O(\delta^{-2})$ operations, up to a multiplicative logarithmic factor.

The stationary extension to u, that is, $\widetilde{u}(t,x) = u_t(\theta_x \mathbf{a})$, solves the parabolic equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \widetilde{u} = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla \widetilde{u} & \text{on } \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{Z}^d, \\ \widetilde{u}(0,\cdot) = \nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}\xi & \text{on } \mathbb{Z}^d. \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

By standard heat kernel bounds, in order to compute $u_t(\mathbf{a}) = \widetilde{u}(t,0)$ up to a negligible error, it suffices to compute the solution to (3.11) in the time-space domain

$$[0,t] \times \{-C\sqrt{t}\log(\delta^{-1}), \dots, C\sqrt{t}\log(\delta^{-1})\}$$

for a sufficiently large constant $C(d,\Lambda) < \infty$, and with, say, Dirichlet boundary condition. Under our "make-believe" assumption, the number of necessary operations for this computation is simply the volume of the time-space domain, that is, $t^{\frac{d}{2}+1}$, up to a logarithmic factor. Recalling from (3.10) that we need to compute $u_{T_\delta(n)}(\mathbf{a}^{(n)})$ for each $n \in \{1, \dots, \lfloor \delta^{-2} \rfloor\}$, we conclude that up to a logarithmic factor, the total number of operations required to compute I_δ is bounded by

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor \delta^{-2} \rfloor} (T_\delta(n))^{\frac{d}{2}+1} \overset{(3.8)}{=} \sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor \delta^{-2} \rfloor} \left(\delta^2 n\right)^{-\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{d}\right)} \le \begin{cases} C\delta^{-2}\log\delta^{-1} & \text{if } d = 2, \\ C\delta^{-2} & \text{if } d \ge 3, \end{cases}$$

as announced.

Remark 3.4. In fact, in dimension $d > 2$, Proposition 3.2 and the computation above can even be slightly optimized. Indeed, in this case, if instead of (3.4), one chooses

$$N_\delta(t) := \lfloor \delta^{-2}(1 \vee t)^{-d+\alpha} \rfloor \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\},$$

for some $\alpha \in (0, d-2)$, then this corresponds to

$$T_\delta(t) = (\delta^2 n)^{-\frac{1}{d-\alpha}},$$

and the complexity analysis above remains valid. Moreover, this choice of $N_\delta(t)$ allows to remove the logarithm in (3.2).

3.4. **Using spatial averages.** We now explore a first variant of the algorithm described in Proposition 3.2. The idea is to perform all computations for a single coefficient field $\mathbf{a}$, and rely on the mixing properties of u to recover independence, instead of using independent draws $\mathbf{a}^{(1)}, \mathbf{a}^{(2)}, \ldots$ This modification does not prevent a possible parallelization of the algorithm, provided that the patching of local solutions is suitably taken care of. The main advantage of this modification is that we then only need to introduce a "global" boundary layer around the sampled region, as opposed to one around each computed point.

Proposition 3.5. *For each $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$ and $t \in [0, \delta^{-2}]$, define the box*

$$\mathsf{B}_\delta(t) := \left[-\left\lfloor \delta^{-\frac{2}{d}} (1 \vee t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \delta^{-\frac{2}{d}} (1 \vee t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor \right]^d \cap \mathbb{Z}^d, \tag{3.12}$$

and let

$$J_\delta := \int_0^{\delta^{-2/d}} \frac{1}{|\mathsf{B}_\delta(t)|} \sum_{x \in \mathsf{B}_\delta(t)} u^2(t,x) \, \mathrm{d}t.$$

There exists $C(d, \Lambda) < \infty$ such that for every $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(J_\delta - I)^2 \right] \le C \delta^2 \log^2 \delta^{-1}. \tag{3.13}$$

Note that up to integer parts, the side length of the box $B_\delta(t)$ is $\sqrt{t}(N_\delta(t))^{\frac{1}{d}}$. The factor of $\sqrt{t}$ is the correlation length, and the factor $(N_\delta(t))^{\frac{1}{d}}$ ensures that there are about $N_\delta(t)$ roughly independent samples inside the box.

In order to justify Proposition 3.5, we need to measure the mixing properties of u^2. We write

$$B_r := \{-r, \ldots, r\}^d. \tag{3.14}$$

Proposition 3.6. *There exists $C(d, \Lambda) < \infty$ such that for every $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \ge 0$,*

$$\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[\frac{1}{|B_r|} \sum_{x \in B_r} u^2(t,x) \right] \le C \left[1 \wedge \frac{t^{\frac{d}{2}}}{|B_r|} \right] (1 \vee t)^{-(d+2)}. \tag{3.15}$$

A weaker version of Proposition 3.6, with (3.15) replaced by

$$\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[\frac{1}{|B_r|} \sum_{x \in B_r} u^2(t,x) \right] \le C \left[1 \wedge \frac{t^{\frac{d}{2}} \log^d(2 \vee t)}{|B_r|} \right] (1 \vee t)^{-(d+2)}, \tag{3.16}$$

can be obtained as an easy consequence of Proposition 3.3. Indeed, bounding the variance by the second moment, using Jensen's inequality and then Proposition 3.3 with $p = 4$, we get

$$\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[\frac{1}{|B_r|}\sum_{x\in B_r} u^2(t,x)\right] \le \mathbb{E}[u^4(t,0)] \le C(1\vee t)^{-(d+2)}. \tag{3.17}$$

Moreover, standard heat kernel bounds allow to show that $u(t,x)$ depends only on the coefficient field in a ball of radius $C\sqrt{t}\log(2\vee t)$ centered around x, up to an error of t^{-100d}, say, for a constant $C(d,\Lambda) < \infty$. This suffices to justify (3.16), and then to prove (4.6) with a larger exponent on the logarithm.

It is however interesting to show that the extra logarithm in (3.16) is spurious, since this is the basis for the claim that the size of the boundary layers is reduced in this algorithm, compared with that of Proposition 3.2.

In order to do so, we will make use of [23, Theorem 3], which we now recall. For each $e \in \mathbb{B}$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $t \ge 0$, we introduce the weight function

$$w_e(t,x) := \left(1 \vee \frac{|x-e|^2}{1\vee t}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where we use the notation $|x-e|$ to denote the distance between x and the endpoint of the edge e closest to x.

Proposition 3.7 ([23])**.** *There exists an exponent $p_0(d,\Lambda) > 1$ and, for every $\alpha < \infty$, a constant $C(d,\Lambda,\alpha) < \infty$ such that for every $1 \le p \le p_0$, $e \in \mathbb{B}$ and $t \ge 0$, the inequality*

$$\left(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \left(w_e^\alpha(t,x)|\nabla G(t,x,e)|^2\right)^p\right)^{\frac{1}{2p}} \le C(1\vee t)^{-\left(\frac{d}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\right)+\frac{d}{2}\frac{1}{2p}}$$

holds almost surely.

In dimension $d = 2$, the following observation will also prove useful.

Lemma 3.8. *There exists $C(d,\Lambda) < \infty$ such that for every $t \ge 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla u_t|^2\right] \le C(1\vee t)^{-\left(\frac{d}{2}+2\right)}.$$

The proof of Lemma 3.8 is postponed to the next section, see the end of Subsection 4.1.

Proof of Proposition 3.6. By (3.17), we may and will restrict our attention to the case $r \ge \sqrt{t}$.

We first recall the Efron-Stein, or spectral gap inequality. Let $(\mathbf{a}'_e)_{e\in\mathbb{B}}$ be an independent copy of the environment $(\mathbf{a}_e)_{e\in\mathbb{B}}$, defined on the same probability space. For each edge $e \in \mathbb{B}$, we let $\mathbf{a}^e$ be the environment defined by

$$\mathbf{a}^e_b := \begin{cases} \mathbf{a}_b & \text{if } b \ne e, \\ \mathbf{a}'_e & \text{if } b = e. \end{cases} \tag{3.18}$$

In other words, the environment $\mathbf{a}^e$ is obtained from the environment $\mathbf{a}$ by resampling the conductance at the edge e. By the independence assumption

on the conductances $(\mathbf{a}_e)$, every random variable f satisfies the Efron-Stein inequality

$$\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}[f] \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[(\partial_e f)^2 \right], \tag{3.19}$$

where $\partial_e f$ denotes the Glauber derivative:

$$\partial_e f(a) := f(\mathbf{a}^e) - f(\mathbf{a}).$$

Applying this inequality to our problem yields that

$$\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[\sum_{x \in B_r} u^2(t,x) \right] \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x \in B_r} \partial_e \left(u^2(t,x) \right) \right)^2 \right].$$

For each edge e, we write

$$u_e^+(t,x) := |u(\mathbf{a}^e,t,x)| + |u(\mathbf{a},t,x)|, \tag{3.20}$$

where we stressed the dependency on the environment $\mathbf{a}$ or $\mathbf{a}^e$ in the notation. Note that the environment $\mathbf{a}^e$ has the same law as $\mathbf{a}$. Moreover,

$$\left| \partial_e \left(u^2(t,x) \right) \right| \leq u_e^+(t,x) \, \left| \partial_e u(t,x) \right|.$$

We fix an exponent $\alpha > d$. By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in B_r} \partial_e \left(u^2(t,x) \right) &\leq \sum_{x \in B_r} u_e^+(t,x) \, |\partial_e u(t,x)| \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{x \in B_r} w_e^{-\alpha} |u_e^+|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{x \in B_r} w_e^{\alpha} |\partial_e u|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we dropped the arguments (t,x) in the last line for clarity. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[\sum_{x \in B_r} u^2(t,x) \right] \\ &\qquad \leq \sum_{e \in \mathbb{B}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x \in B_r} w_e^{-\alpha} |u_e^+|^2 \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x \in B_r} w_e^{\alpha} |\partial_e u|^2 \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

By Hölder's inequality,

$$\left(\sum_{x \in B_r} w_e^{-\alpha} |u_e^+|^2 \right)^2 \leq \left(\sum_{x \in B_r} w_e^{-\alpha} \right) \left(\sum_{x \in B_r} w_e^{-\alpha} |u_e^+|^4 \right).$$

Hence, by (3.20) and Proposition 3.3 with $p = 4$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x \in B_r} w_e^{-\alpha} |u_e^+|^2 \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C(1 \vee t)^{-1} \left(1 \vee \frac{\mathrm{dist}(e, B_r)^2}{1 \vee t} \right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}. \tag{3.22}$$

If we temporarily admit that there exists a constant $C(d,\Lambda,\alpha)<\infty$ such that for every $e\in\mathbb{B}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x\in B_r} w_e^\alpha |\partial_e u|^2\right)^2\right]^{\frac12} \le C(1\vee t)^{-\left(\frac{d}{2}+1\right)}, \tag{3.23}$$

then we can combine the two bounds (3.22) and (3.23) into (3.21) and thus complete the proof of Proposition 3.6.

It therefore remains to show (3.23). We recall from [23, Lemma 3] that there exists $C(d,\Lambda)<\infty$ such that

$$|\partial_e u(t,x)| \le C\,|\nabla G(t,x,e)| + \int_0^t |\nabla G(t-s,x,e)g(s,e)|\,\mathrm{d}s, \tag{3.24}$$

where $g(s,e)$ is a random variable that satisfies, for each $p<\infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|g(s,e)|^p\right]^{\frac1p} \le C\mathbb{E}\left[|\nabla u(s,e)|^p\right]^{\frac1p}. \tag{3.25}$$

By Proposition 3.7 with $p=1$, the first term on the right side of (3.24) is handled without difficulty. It therefore suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} w_e^\alpha(t,x)\left|\int_0^t |\nabla G(t-s,x,e)g(s,e)|\,\mathrm{d}s\right|^2\right)^2\right]^{\frac12} \le C(1\vee t)^{-\left(\frac{d}{2}+1\right)}. \tag{3.26}$$

We first note for future reference that by Hölder's inequality, (3.25), Lemma 3.8 and Proposition 3.3, there exists a constant $C(d,\Lambda)<\infty$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|g(s,e)|^4\right]^{\frac14} \le \mathbb{E}[|g(s,e)|^2]^{\frac12}\,\mathbb{E}[|g(s,e)|^6]^{\frac16} \le Ct^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}+1\right)}. \tag{3.27}$$

We now proceed to estimate the sum on the left side of (3.26). By the integral triangle inequality,

$$\left(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} w_e^\alpha(t,x)\left|\int_0^t |\nabla G(t-s,x,e)g(s,e)|\,\mathrm{d}s\right|^2\right)^{\frac12} \le \int_0^t \left(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} w_e^\alpha(t,x)\,|\nabla G(t-s,x,e)g(s,e)|^2\right)^{\frac12}\mathrm{d}s.$$

Applying the triangle inequality again, we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} w_e^\alpha(t,x)\left|\int_0^t |\nabla G(t-s,x,e)g(s,e)|\,\mathrm{d}s\right|^2\right)^2\right]^{\frac14} \le \int_0^t \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} w_e^\alpha(t,x)\,|\nabla G(t-s,x,e)g(s,e)|^2\right)^2\right]^{\frac14}\mathrm{d}s. \tag{3.28}$$

We fix $p = p_0(d, \Lambda) > 1$ as given by Proposition 3.7, and denote by $q \in (1, \infty)$ its conjugate exponent. We also give ourselves an exponent $\beta > 0$ to be specified later. By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_e^\alpha(t,x) \left| \nabla G(t-s,x,e) g(s,e) \right|^2 \\
&\quad \leq \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_e^\alpha(t,x) w_e^{\beta p}(t-s,x) \left| \nabla G(t-s,x,e) \right|^{2p} \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\qquad \times \left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_e^\alpha(t,x) w_e^{-\beta q}(t-s,x) \left| g(s,e) \right|^{2q} \right)^{\frac{1}{q}}
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 3.7, the first term is deterministically bounded by a constant times

$$(1 \vee |t-s|)^{-(d+1)+\frac{d}{2}\frac{1}{p}}.$$

Moreover, using the triangle inequality one last time, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} w_e^\alpha(t,x) w_e^{-\beta q}(t-s,x) \left| g(s,e) \right|^{2q} \right)^{\frac{2}{q}} \right]^{\frac{q}{2}} \\
&\quad \leq \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(w_e^\alpha(t,x) w_e^{-\beta q}(t-s,x) \left| g(s,e) \right|^{2q} \right)^{\frac{2}{q}} \right]^{\frac{q}{2}} \\
&\quad \leq C \left(1 \vee |t-s|\right)^{\frac{d}{2}} \left(1 \vee s\right)^{-2q\left(\frac{d}{4}+1\right)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we chose $\beta < \infty$ sufficiently large and used (3.27) and Proposition 3.3 in the last step. The quantity on the left of (3.28) is therefore bounded by a constant times

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t (1 \vee |t-s|)^{-\left(\frac{d}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\right)+\frac{d}{2}\frac{1}{2p}} (1 \vee |t-s|)^{\frac{d}{2}\frac{1}{2q}} \left(1 \vee s\right)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}+1\right)} \mathrm{d}s \\
&\quad = \int_0^t (1 \vee |t-s|)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}+\frac{1}{2}\right)} \left(1 \vee s\right)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}+1\right)} \mathrm{d}s \\
&\quad \leq C(1 \vee t)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}+\frac{1}{2}\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (3.26), and therefore of (3.23) and of Proposition 3.6. □

Proof of Proposition 3.5. We decompose again the analysis into expectation and variance.

The expectation is equal to the right side of (3.6), so we can conclude as in (3.7) for this part.

Turning now to the analysis of the variance, we note that

$$\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[J_\delta\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int_0^{\delta^{-2/d}} \frac{1}{|\mathsf{B}_\delta(t)|} \sum_{x \in \mathsf{B}_\delta(t)} \left\{ u^2(t,x) - \mathbb{E}\left[u^2(t,x)\right] \right\} \mathrm{d}t \right)^2 \right].$$

By the integral triangle inequality,

$$\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\,[J_\delta]^{\frac12} \le \int_0^{\delta^{-2/d}} \mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[\frac{1}{|\mathsf{B}_\delta(t)|}\sum_{x\in\mathsf{B}_\delta(t)} u^2(t,x)\right]^{\frac12} \mathrm{d}t.$$

By Proposition 3.6, the latter is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} C\int_0^{\delta^{-2/d}} \frac{t^{\frac{d}{4}}}{|\sqrt{\mathsf{B}_\delta(t)}|}\,(1\vee t)^{-\left(\frac{d}{2}+1\right)}\,\mathrm{d}t &\le C\int_0^{-\delta^{-2/d}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_\delta(t)}}(1\vee t)^{-\left(\frac{d}{2}+1\right)}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\le C\int_0^{-\delta^{-2/d}} \delta(1\vee t)^{\frac{d}{2}-\left(\frac{d}{2}+1\right)}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\le C\delta\log\delta^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

4. Iterated resolvents

The goal of this section is to devise variants of the algorithms described in the previous section that do not involve the fine-scale resolution of the parabolic equation in time. In line with a coarse numerical scheme for this equation, we will show that we can instead rely on iterating the operator $(\mathrm{Id}-\nabla\cdot\mathbf{a}\nabla)^{-1}$. This operator is essentially local in space, and therefore computationally affordable.

4.1. Spectral theory.

In order to achieve our goal, we first introduce a convenient tool from spectral theory. While this is not absolutely necessary, it brings a useful insight into the problem and allows for streamlined arguments.

Recall that $\mathcal{L}=-D\cdot\mathbf{a}D$ is a non-negative self-adjoint operator on $L^2(\Omega)$. Hence, for every $f\in L^2(\Omega)$, there exists a measure e_f on $\mathbb{R}_+$ such that for every measurable function $\Psi:\mathbb{R}_+\to\mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[f\,\Psi(\mathcal{L})f\right] = \int \Psi(\lambda)\,\mathrm{d}e_f(\lambda).$$

The measure e_f is supported on $\mathbb{R}_+$ since the spectrum of the operator $\mathcal{L}$ is contained there. By self-adjointness, we also have, for every measurable $\Psi_1,\Psi_2:\mathbb{R}_+\to\mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(\Psi_1(\mathcal{L})f)\ (\Psi_2(\mathcal{L})f)\right] = \int \Psi_1(\lambda)\,\Psi_2(\lambda)\,\mathrm{d}e_f(\lambda).$$

We call e_f the spectral measure of $\mathcal{L}$ projected onto the function f. We are in fact only interested in the case $f=\mathfrak{d}$ here. We start by formulating the quantity of interest I from (2.4) in terms of this measure.

Proposition 4.1. *We have*

$$I = \int \frac{1}{2\lambda}\,\mathrm{d}e_{\mathfrak{d}}(\lambda). \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Recall from (2.4) that

$$I = \frac12\,\mathbb{E}[D\phi\cdot\mathbf{a}D\phi].$$

The expectation on the right side is the limit as μ tends to 0 of

$$\mathbb{E}[D\phi_\mu \cdot \mathbf{a} D\phi_\mu] = \mathbb{E}[\phi_\mu \, \mathcal{L}\phi_\mu],$$

and $\phi_\mu = (\mu + \mathcal{L})^{-1}\mathfrak{d}$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}\left[D\phi \cdot \mathbf{a} D\phi\right] = \lim_{\mu \to 0} \int \frac{\lambda}{(\mu + \lambda)^2} \, \mathrm{d}e_{\mathfrak{d}}(\lambda),$$

and the proposition follows by monotone convergence. □

Besides allowing for short proofs, the consideration of the integral in (4.1) is also intuitively revealing, since it displays a separation of scales. The part of the spectral measure away from 0 encodes the short-length properties of the random operator, and will therefore be easy to compute. Our attention should be entirely focused on finding efficient methods for computing the part of integral in (4.1) with small λ, which encodes the longest length scales of the medium.

In order to exemplify the usefulness of the notion of spectral measure, we now give an alternative proof of Proposition 3.1.

Alternative proof of Proposition 3.1. We have

$$\int \frac{1}{\lambda} \, \mathrm{d}e_{\mathfrak{d}}(\lambda) = \int \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} \, \mathrm{d}t \, \mathrm{d}e_{\mathfrak{d}}(\lambda).$$

We apply Fubini's theorem and observe that

$$\int e^{-\lambda t} \, \mathrm{d}e_{\mathfrak{d}}(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}\left[u_{t/2}^2\right]. \qquad \square$$

We conclude this subsection by giving the proof of Lemma 3.8 above.

Proof of Lemma 3.8. It suffices to prove the result uniformly over $t \geq 1$. Since

$$-\partial_t \mathbb{E}\left[u_t^2\right] = 2\,\mathbb{E}\left[\nabla u_t \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u_t\right],$$

it follows from Proposition 3.3 with $p = 2$ that

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_t^{2t} \mathbb{E}[\nabla u_s \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u_s] \, \mathrm{d}s \leq C t^{-\left(\frac{d}{2}+2\right)}.$$

By the spectral representation,

$$\mathbb{E}[\nabla u_s \cdot \mathbf{a} \nabla u_s] = \int \lambda e^{-2\lambda s} \, \mathrm{d}e_{\mathfrak{d}}(\lambda)$$

is monotone in s, so the proof is complete. □

4.2. **Iterated resolvents.** We are now ready to devise an algorithm based on iterations of the resolvent $(\mathrm{Id} - D \cdot \mathbf{a} D)^{-1}$. As was clear in the alternative proof of Proposition 3.1 above, the algorithms based on the parabolic equation are derived from the observation that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} = \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda t} \, \mathrm{d}t.$$

We now use instead that

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{1}{(\lambda + 1)^k}.$$

Integrating the equality above against the spectral measure $e_{\mathfrak{d}}$ and decomposing the sum according to the parity of k, we obtain that

$$I = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}\left[v_{k-1}v_k + v_k^2\right],$$

where the functions $v_k \in L^2(\Omega)$, $k \geq 0$, are defined recursively according to

$$v_0 := \mathfrak{d} \quad \text{and} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N},\ v_{k+1} := (\mathrm{Id} - D \cdot \mathbf{a}D)^{-1} v_k. \tag{4.2}$$

In fact, v_1 is nothing but the "unit mass" regularized corrector ϕ_1, the solution to (2.2) with $\mu = 1$. Recalling (3.3), we have

$$v_1 = \int_0^{\infty} e^{-t}(P_t\mathfrak{d})\,\mathrm{d}t.$$

More generally, for every $k \geq 1$,

$$v_k = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^k} e^{-(t_1+\cdots+t_k)} u_{t_1+\cdots+t_k}\,\mathrm{d}t_1 \cdots \mathrm{d}t_k. \tag{4.3}$$

The estimates we proved for u_k will therefore transfer to estimates for v_k, as we show below. Moreover, as in (3.11), the stationary extension $\widetilde{v}(k,x) := v_k(\theta_x\mathbf{a})$ solves the "spatial" elliptic problem

$$(\mathrm{Id} - \nabla \cdot \mathbf{a}\nabla)\widetilde{v}(k+1,x) = \widetilde{v}(k,x) \qquad k \in \mathbb{N},\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

Recall that we often abuse notation and write $v(k,x)$ instead of $\widetilde{v}(k,x)$. The next lemma provides us with quantitative information on the size and correlations of v.

Lemma 4.2. (i) *For every $p \in [1,\infty)$, there exists $C(d,\Lambda,p) < \infty$ such that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|v_k|^p\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C(1 \vee k)^{-\left(\frac{d}{4}+\frac{1}{2}\right)}.$$

(ii) *There exists $C(d,\Lambda) < \infty$ such that for every $r, k \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathbb{V}\mathrm{ar}\left[\frac{1}{|B_r|}\sum_{x\in B_r} v^2(k,x)\right] \leq C\left[1 \wedge \frac{k^{\frac{d}{2}}}{|B_r|}\right](1 \vee k)^{-(d+2)}.$$

Proof. We can benefit from a probabilistic representation of the formula (4.3). Let $T_1, T_2, \ldots$ be independent exponential random variables of mean 1, independent of the rest of the problem. We denote by $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{E}$ the probability and expectation with respect to these random variables, so that

$$v(k,x) = \mathbf{E}\left[u(T_1 + \cdots + T_k, x)\right]. \tag{4.4}$$

By a standard large-deviation argument, the probability

$$\mathbf{P}\left[T_1 + \cdots + T_k \leq \frac{k}{2}\right]$$

decays exponentially in k. The lemma therefore follows from Fubini's theorem and Propositions 3.3 and 3.6. □

We could of course present an algorithm similar to that defined in Proposition 3.2, but based on v_k instead of u_t. We move directly to the method similar to Proposition 3.5, since it is the most convenient one in practice.

Proposition 4.3. *Recall the definition of the box* B_δ *in* (3.12)*, of* v_k *in* (3.1)-(4.2)*, that we write* $v(k,x) = v_k(\theta_x \mathbf{a})$*, and let*

$$S_\delta := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \delta^{-2/d} \rfloor} \frac{1}{|\mathsf{B}_\delta(k)|} \sum_{x \in \mathsf{B}_\delta(k)} \left(v(k-1,x)\, v(k,x) + v^2(k,x) \right). \tag{4.5}$$

There exists $C(d,\Lambda) < \infty$ *such that for every* $\delta \in (0,1/2]$*,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[(S_\delta - I)^2 \right] \leq C \delta^2 \log^2 \delta^{-1}. \tag{4.6}$$

The proof is identical to that of Proposition 3.5, using Lemma 4.2, so we do not repeat it.

4.3. **Complexity analysis.** We can now fully justify the partly unfounded point of view discussed in Subesction 3.3. We first note that in order to compute v on a time-space rectangle $[0,k] \times B_r$, one may restrict to a domain of the form $[0,k] \times B_{r + C\sqrt{k}\log(\delta^{-1})}$, with, say, Dirichlet boundary condition. Indeed, standard heat kernel estimates show that the error thus produced is smaller than any given power of δ if the constant C is chosen sufficiently large.

For the same reason, when computing $v(k+1,x)$ given $v(k,\cdot)$, we can restrict ourselves to an elliptic problem posed on $x + B_{C\log(\delta^{-1})}$ with, say, Dirichlet boundary condition. The error can be made smaller than any power of δ provided that C is sufficiently large. This computation requires no more than a power of $\log(\delta^{-1})$ operations.

Neglecting multiplicative logarithms, we deduce that the number of operations required to compute the quantity S_δ in (4.5) is simply the volume of the domain

$$\bigcup_{k=0}^{\lfloor \delta^{-2/d} \rfloor} \{k\} \times \mathsf{B}_\delta(k). \tag{4.7}$$

Indeed, by the definition of $B_\delta(k)$, the side length of this box is

$$1 + 2 \left\lfloor \delta^{-\frac{2}{d}} (1 \vee k)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor \geq \sqrt{k},$$

since $k \leq \delta^{-2/d}$. Moreover, the sets $B_\delta(k)$ are decreasing as k increases, so we see that the necessary boundary layer does not increase the size of the set by more than a multiplicative logarithmic factor. To conclude, there remains to estimate the volume of the domain in (4.7). It is

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \delta^{-2/d} \rfloor} \left(1 + 2 \left\lfloor \delta^{-\frac{2}{d}} (1 \vee k)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\rfloor \right)^d \leq \begin{cases} C\delta^{-2} \log(\delta^{-1}) & \text{if } d = 2, \\ C\delta^{-2} & \text{if } d > 2. \end{cases}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Finally, we point out that as in Remark 3.4, in dimension $d > 2$, we can slightly increase the side length of the averaging box, replacing $\mathsf{B}_\delta(k)$ by $\mathsf{B}_\delta(k^{1-\varepsilon})$ for some small exponent $\varepsilon > 0$. With this choice of box, the logarithm in (4.6) can be removed, while the condition $\varepsilon < 1 - \frac{2}{d}$ ensures that the complexity analysis above remains valid.

5. Discrete-time parabolic equation

In this section, we explore the possibility to replace the continuous-time parabolic equation used in Section 3 by a discrete-time one. This possibility is probably only computationally useful when the underlying state space is discrete. However, in this case it does save some logarithmic factors, so it is the method we chose to implement numerically.

We set

$$\pi(\mathbf{a}) := \sum_{x\sim 0} \mathbf{a}_{0x}.$$

The operator $\pi^{-1}D^* \cdot \mathbf{a}D$ is self-adjoint on $L^2(\Omega, \pi(\mathbf{a})\,\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{a}))$. We denote by ν its spectral measure projected onto the function $\pi^{-1}\mathfrak{d}$.

Proposition 5.1. *We have*

$$I = \int \frac{1}{2\lambda} \mathrm{d}\nu(\lambda). \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. Recall from (2.4) that

$$I = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\left[D\phi \cdot \mathbf{a}D\phi\right],$$

where $D\phi$ is the L^2 limit of $D\phi_\mu$, see (2.3). Let ψ_μ solve

$$\left(\mu + \pi^{-1}D^* \cdot \mathbf{a}D\right)\psi_\mu = \pi^{-1}\mathfrak{d}.$$

By the same arguments allowing to justify (2.3), we can verify that

$$D\psi_\mu \xrightarrow[\mu\to 0]{L^2(\Omega)} D\phi.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[D\phi \cdot \mathbf{a}D\phi\right] = \lim_{\mu\to 0} \mathbb{E}\left[D\psi_\mu \cdot \mathbf{a}D\psi_\mu\right].$$

The expectation on the right side equals

$$\int \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda+\mu)^2}\,\mathrm{d}\nu(\lambda).$$

The result follows from the monotone convergence theorem. □

Note that

$$\left(\mathrm{Id} - \pi^{-1}D^* \cdot \mathbf{a}D\right) f = \pi^{-1}(\mathbf{a}) \sum_{x\sim 0} \mathbf{a}_{0x} f(\theta_x\,\mathbf{a}),$$

and therefore $(\mathrm{Id} - \pi^{-1}D^* \cdot \mathbf{a}D)$ is the generator of a discrete-time Markov chain, and in particular is a contraction in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Its spectrum is therefore contained in $[-1, 1]$, and the spectrum of the operator $-\pi^{-1}D^* \cdot \mathbf{a}D$ itself is contained in $[0, 2]$. In particular, the measure ν is supported on $[0, 2]$. This is the whole point of considering the operator $-\pi^{-1}D^* \cdot \mathbf{a}D$ instead of $-D^* \cdot \mathbf{a}D$. We now notice that for every $\lambda \in [0, 2]$,

$$\frac{1}{2\lambda} = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{2}\right)^k. \tag{5.2}$$

This motivates the definition of w_k defined inductively by

$$w_0 := \pi^{-1}\mathfrak{d} \quad \text{and} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N},\ w_{k+1} := \left(\mathrm{Id} - \frac{1}{2}\pi^{-1} D \cdot \mathbf{a} D\right) w_k. \tag{5.3}$$

By Proposition 5.1 and (5.2), we obtain

$$I = \frac{1}{4}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\pi\, w_k^2\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\pi\, w_k w_{k+1}\right]\right). \tag{5.4}$$

As before, if we write $\widetilde{w}(k,x) := w_k(\theta_x \mathbf{a})$, then the function w solves the discrete-time parabolic equation

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{w}(k+1,x) &= \widetilde{w}(k,x) - \frac{1}{2\pi(x)} \nabla^* \mathbf{a} \nabla \widetilde{w}(k,x) \quad \text{for } (k,x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Z}^d, \\ \widetilde{w}(0,x) &= \frac{1}{\pi(x)} \mathfrak{d}(\theta_x \mathbf{a}), \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d. \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

From now on, we simply write $w(k,x)$ instead of $\widetilde{w}(k,x)$. We also write $\pi(x) = \pi(\theta_x \mathbf{a})$. Recalling the definition of the box B_δ in (3.12) and Proposition 4.3, the identity (5.4) suggests that we compute

$$\widetilde{S}_\delta := \frac{1}{4}\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \delta^{-2/d} \rfloor} \frac{1}{|\mathsf{B}_\delta(k)|} \sum_{x \in \mathsf{B}_\delta(k)} \pi(x) \left(w^2(k,x) + w(k,x) w(k+1,x)\right) \tag{5.6}$$

as an approximation of I.

It is very likely that the proof of Proposition 4.3 can be adapted to show that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\widetilde{S}_\delta - I\right)\right] \le \delta^2 \log^2 \delta^{-1}.$$

This would require to adapt some of the arguments of [23] to the discrete-time setting. We will not expose the necessary adjustments here. We simply mention that [22, Proposition 3.2] gives a quantitative upper bound on the tail behavior of the spectral measure ν near the origin. This estimate is already sufficient to show that there exists $k < \infty$ such that

$$0 \le I - \mathbb{E}\left[\widetilde{S}_\delta\right] \le O(\delta \log^k \delta^{-1})$$

in dimensions d such that $2 \le d \le 6$ (with $k = 0$ when $3 \le d \le 5$).

6. Numerical tests

The goal of this section is to explore numerically the methods introduced in the previous sections. The code was written in the Julia language, and can be downloaded as part of the source files of the arXiv posting of this paper.

We focus on a two-dimensional case, with conductances taking the values $c_- = 1$ and $c_+ = 9$ with probability $1/2$ each. This is a rare example for which the homogenized matrix is know analytically (see e.g. [20, Appendix A]): it is $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = \sqrt{c_- c_+}\,\mathrm{Id} = 3\,\mathrm{Id}$. Hence, recalling that $|\xi| = 1$, we have $I = 1$ on this example. For the numerics, we fixed $\xi = (1,1)/\sqrt{2}$.

It is more convenient to implement a method for which the averaging box $\mathsf{B}_\delta(k)$ in (5.6) remains of a fixed size over dyadic intervals of time. This changes nothing to the arguments exposed above. Recall from (3.12) the relation between the running time and the size of the box on which we perform spatial

ℓ	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$2^{\frac{\ell d}{2}}\mathbb{E}[(6.1)]$	0.60	0.42	0.39	0.39	0.40	0.39	0.39	0.38

TABLE 6.1. The mean of (6.1) (independent of r) is about $C2^{-\frac{\ell d}{2}}$.

$r \diagdown \ell$	0	1	2	3	4	5
1	0.50	0.25	0.26	0.30	0.34	0.35
2	0.44	0.15	0.12	0.10	0.09	0.13
4	0.43	0.15	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.11
8	0.43	0.16	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.13
16	0.42	0.16	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14

TABLE 6.2. The variance of (6.1) divided by $2^{-\ell d}\left(1 \wedge 2^{\frac{\ell d}{2}}|B_r|^{-1}\right)$.

averages. Using that $d = 2$ in our example and fixing the precision at $\delta = 2^{-L}$ for some integer L, we see that for a running time $k \simeq 2^\ell$, we should take an average over a box of side length of order $\delta^{-1}(1 \vee k)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \simeq 2^{L-\frac{\ell}{2}}$. We therefore define

$$D_L := \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1}\sum_{k=2^\ell-1}^{2^{\ell+1}-2}\frac{1}{|B_{r(L,\ell)}|}\sum_{x\in B_{r(L,\ell)}}\pi(x)\left(w^2(k,x)+w(k,x)w(k+1,x)\right),$$

where

$$r(L,\ell) := \left\lfloor 2^{L-\frac{\ell}{2}}\right\rfloor.$$

We first study numerically the mean and variance of

$$\sum_{k=2^\ell-1}^{2^{\ell+1}-2}\frac{1}{|B_r|}\sum_{x\in B_r}\pi(x)\left(w^2(k,x)+w(k,x)w(k+1,x)\right) \tag{6.1}$$

as a function of r and ℓ. We used a boundary layer of width $5(\ell+1)\cdot 2^{\frac{\ell}{2}}$ for the computation. The expectation of the quantity in (6.1) is of course independent of r. The discrete-time analog to Proposition 3.3 (with $p = 2$) would ensure that this expectation is smaller than a constant times $2^{-\frac{\ell d}{2}}$. Table 6.1 confirms the shaprness of this bound, and suggests that the multiplicative prefactor stabilizes at about 0.4. Moreover, denoting by (α_ℓ) the numbers in Table 6.1 (that is, $\alpha_0 = 0.60$, $\alpha_1 = 0.42$, etc.), we expect that the difference

$$\left|I - \sum_{\ell=0}^{7} 2^{-\frac{\ell d}{2}}\alpha_\ell\right|$$

is of the order of 2^{-7}. We can check that this is indeed the case.



FIGURE 6.1. The quantity in (6.3) as a function of L. The error bars are 95% confidence intervals. The slope of the regression line is about -0.9.

A discrete-time analog to Proposition 3.6 suggests that the variance of the quantity in (6.1) is bounded by a constant times

$$\left(\sum_{k=2^{\ell-1}}^{2^\ell-2} \left[1 \wedge \frac{k^{\frac{d}{4}}}{\sqrt{|B_r|}} \right] (1 \vee k)^{-\left(\frac{d}{2}+1\right)} \right)^2 \leq C \left[1 \wedge \frac{2^{\frac{\ell d}{2}}}{|B_r|} \right] 2^{-\ell d}. \tag{6.2}$$

Again, Table 6.2 confirms the sharpness of this bound, and reveals a small multiplicative prefactor which stabilizes at about 0.1.

We now conclude by presenting the numerical analysis of D_L itself. Figure 6.1 displays the value of

$$\log_2 \left(\mathbb{E} \left[(I - D_L)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \tag{6.3}$$

as a function of L. Ignoring logarithms, the theoretical analysis suggests that this is bounded by an affine function of L with slope -1. Numerically, we observe a slope of -0.9 and no measurable intercept.

The computations were performed on a laptop computer with a 2.30 GHz processor and 8 Go of RAM. On this architecture, it takes less than 4.5 minutes to compute D_{13}. Figure 6.2 displays the base-2 logarithm of the CPU time needed to compute D_L, in seconds, as a function of L. Ignoring again logarithms,



FIGURE 6.2. The base-2 logarithm of the CPU time used to compute D_L, in seconds, as a function of L. The slope of the regression line is about 1.8.

the theoretical analysis suggests that this is bounded by an affine function of L with slope 2. Numerically, we observe a slope of 1.8 and an intercept of about -15.6. The small discrepancy between the theoretical and observed slopes in Figures 6.1 and 6.2 may be due to the logarithmic factors. Strikingly, the ratio of the two slopes is very close to the predicted value of -2, in full agreement with Theorem 1.

7. Complexity lower bound

The goal of this section is to prove Proposition 1.1. Since this proposition was stated relatively loosely, we first make more precise. The number of operations of a given algorithm is a random variable; at precision $\delta > 0$, we call this random variable $\mathcal{N}_\delta$. The assumption we wish to contradict is that $\delta^2 \mathcal{N}_\delta$ tends to 0 in probability, as δ tends to 0. We will contradict it for a specific choice of the law of the random environment. However, it will be clear that the proof is very generic, and that the specific choice we make is only a matter of convenient notation and computation. Indeed, the only key point is to observe that "generically", the Kullback-Leibler divergence (a.k.a. relative entropy) responds quadratically to perturbations.

Proof of Proposition 1.1. For each $p \in [0,1]$, let $\mathbb{P}_p$ denote the product measure

$$\mathbb{P}_p = \bigotimes_{e \in \mathbb{B}} (p\delta_1 + (1-p)\delta_2),$$

where δ_x denotes the Dirac probability measure at $x \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote by $\mathbb{E}_p$ the associated expectation, and take $(\mathbf{a}_e)_{e\in\mathbb{B}}$ to be the canonical random variable on $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{B}}$. Let $\bar{\mathbf{a}}(p)$ be the homogenized matrix associated with the law $\mathbb{P}_p$. By [40], the mapping $p \mapsto \bar{\mathbf{a}}(p)$ is C^1 on $[0,1]$, and it is not constant since $\bar{\mathbf{a}}(0) \neq \bar{\mathbf{a}}(1)$. We will argue that in order for $\bar{\mathbf{a}}(p)$ to be determined within an error of δ, the algorithm must query the values of at least $\simeq \delta^{-2}$ conductances, and therefore perform at least $\simeq \delta^{-2}$ operations. Since the law is of product form, we may assume without loss of generality that the algorithm queries $\mathbf{a}_{e_1}, \mathbf{a}_{e_2}, \ldots$ in order, where $e_1, e_2, \ldots$ is an arbitrary sequence of distinct elements of $\mathbb{B}$.

For every $p, q \in (0,1)$, every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and every event $A \in \sigma\left(\mathbf{a}_{e_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{e_n}, e \in \mathcal{E}\right)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_q\left[A\right] &= \mathbb{E}_p\left[\mathbb{1}_A \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{q}{p}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_{e_i}=1} + \frac{1-q}{1-p}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_{e_i}=2}\right)\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_p\left[\mathbb{1}_A \exp\left(\widehat{\mathrm{kl}}(q,p,n)\right)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

where we introduced the "empirical" Kullback-Leibler divergence

$$\widehat{\mathrm{kl}}(q,p,n) := \sum_{i=1}^n \log\left(\frac{q}{p}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_{e_i}=1} + \frac{1-q}{1-p}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_{e_i}=2}\right).$$

The "true" Kullback-Leibler divergence between Bernoulli random variables with parameters q and p is the expectation of each of these summands, that is,

$$\mathrm{kl}(q,p) := p\log\frac{q}{p} + (1-p)\log\frac{1-q}{1-p} \geq 0.$$

Differentiating with respect to q, we verify that for each $\eta \in (0, 1/2)$, there exists $C(\eta) < \infty$ such that

$$\forall p, q \in (\eta, 1-\eta), \quad \mathrm{kl}(q,p) \leq C(q-p)^2.$$

We also verify that

$$\forall p, q \in (\eta, 1-\eta), \quad \log\left(\frac{q}{p}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_{e_i}=1} + \frac{1-q}{1-p}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{a}_{e_i}=2}\right) \leq C|q-p|.$$

In particular, uniformly over $p, q \in (\eta, 1-\eta)$ and $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}_p\left[\left(\widehat{\mathrm{kl}}(q,p,n)\right)^2\right] \leq Cn|q-p|^2 + Cn^2|q-p|^4. \tag{7.2}$$

If an algorithm can compute $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta$ in $o(\delta^{-2})$ operations, we can define a deterministic $N_\delta = o(\delta^{-2})$ such that the algorithm queries only the edges $e_1, \ldots, e_{N_\delta}$ with probability at least $1/2$. Denoting by $\mathcal{E}_\delta$ the event that only edges $e_1, \ldots, e_{N_\delta}$ are queried, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_q\left[(\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta - \bar{\mathbf{a}}(q))^2\right] \geq \mathbb{E}_p\left[(\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta - \bar{\mathbf{a}}(q))^2\, \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}_\delta}\, \exp\left(\widehat{\mathrm{kl}}(q,p,N_\delta)\right)\right].$$

We choose q_δ in such a way that

$$\delta \ll q_\delta - p \ll N_\delta^{-1/2}, \tag{7.3}$$

in the sense that the ratio of the right to the left side of both inequalities diverge to infinity as $\delta \to 0$. Let $\mathcal{E}'_\delta$ be the conjunction of $\mathcal{E}_\delta$ with the event that $\widehat{\mathrm{kl}}(q_\delta, p, N_\delta) \geq -1$. Combining the three previous displays, we obtain, for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$\mathbb{E}_{q_\delta}\left[|\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta - \bar{\mathbf{a}}(q_\delta)|^2\right] \geq \mathbb{E}_p\left[|\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta - \bar{\mathbf{a}}(q_\delta)|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}'_\delta}\right] \exp(-1), \qquad \mathbb{P}_p\left[\mathcal{E}'_\delta\right] \geq 1/4.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}_p\left[|\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta - \bar{\mathbf{a}}(p)|^2\right] \leq \delta^2$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\bar{\mathbf{a}}(p) - \bar{\mathbf{a}}(q_\delta)| &\leq 4\mathbb{E}_p[|\bar{\mathbf{a}}(p) - \bar{\mathbf{a}}(q_\delta)|\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}'_\delta}] \\
&\leq 4\mathbb{E}_p\left[|\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta - \bar{\mathbf{a}}(q_\delta)|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}'_\delta}\right]^{1/2} + 4\mathbb{E}_p\left[|\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta - \bar{\mathbf{a}}(p)|^2 \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{E}'_\delta}\right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq 8\mathbb{E}_{q_\delta}\left[|\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_\delta - \bar{\mathbf{a}}(q_\delta)|^2\right]^{1/2} + 4\delta \\
&\leq 12\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Since our choice of $p \in (0,1)$ was arbitrary, and $p \mapsto \bar{\mathbf{a}}(p)$ is C^1 and non-constant over the interval $[0,1]$, this contradicts (7.3). □

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank Josselin Garnier for an inspiring talk which motivated me to revisit this problem. This work has been partially supported by the ANR Grant LSD (ANR-15-CE40-0020-03).

References

[1] Y. Almog. Averaging of dilute random media: a rigorous proof of the Clausius-Mossotti formula. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 207(3):785–812, 2013.

[2] Y. Almog. The Clausius-Mossotti formula in a dilute random medium with fixed volume fraction. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 12(4):1777–1799, 2014.

[3] A. Anantharaman and C. Le Bris. A numerical approach related to defect-type theories for some weakly random problems in homogenization. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 9(2):513–544, 2011.

[4] A. Anantharaman and C. Le Bris. Elements of mathematical foundations for numerical approaches for weakly random homogenization problems. *Commun. Comput. Phys.*, 11(4):1103–1143, 2012.

[5] D. Arjmand and O. Runborg. A time dependent approach for removing the cell boundary error in elliptic homogenization problems. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 314:206–227, 2016.

[6] S. Armstrong, T. Kuusi, and J.-C. Mourrat. Mesoscopic Higher Regularity and Subadditivity in Elliptic Homogenization. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 347(2):315–361, 2016.

[7] S. N. Armstrong, T. Kuusi, and J.-C. Mourrat. The additive structure of elliptic homogenization, preprint, arXiv:1602.00512.

[8] S. N. Armstrong, T. Kuusi, and J.-C. Mourrat. Scaling limits of energies and correctors, preprint, arXiv:1603.03388.

[9] S. N. Armstrong and J.-C. Mourrat. Lipschitz regularity for elliptic equations with random coefficients. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 219(1):255–348, 2016.

[10] S. N. Armstrong and C. K. Smart. Quantitative stochastic homogenization of convex integral functionals. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 49(2):423–481, 2016.

[11] M. T. Barlow, A. A. Járai, T. Kumagai, and G. Slade. Random walk on the incipient infinite cluster for oriented percolation in high dimensions. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 278(2):385–431, 2008.

[12] G. Ben Arous, M. Cabezas, and A. Fribergh. Scaling limit for the ant in high-dimensional labyrinths, preprint, arXiv:1609.03977.

[13] G. Ben Arous, M. Cabezas, and A. Fribergh. Scaling limit for the ant in a simple labyrinth, preprint, arXiv:1609.03980.

[14] L. Berlyand and V. Mityushev. Generalized Clausius-Mossotti formula for random composite with circular fibers. *J. Statist. Phys.*, 102(1-2):115–145, 2001.
[15] X. Blanc and C. Le Bris. Improving on computation of homogenized coefficients in the periodic and quasi-periodic settings. *Netw. Heterog. Media*, 5(1):1–29, 2010.
[16] M. Damron, J. Hanson, and P. Sosoe. Subdiffusivity of random walk on the 2D invasion percolation cluster. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 123(9):3588–3621, 2013.
[17] M. Duerinckx and A. Gloria. Analyticity of homogenized coefficients under Bernoulli perturbations and the Clausius-Mossotti formulas. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 220(1):297–361, 2016.
[18] Y. Efendiev and T. Y. Hou. *Multiscale finite element methods*, volume 4 of *Surveys and Tutorials in the Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer, New York, 2009. Theory and applications.
[19] A.-C. Egloffe, A. Gloria, J.-C. Mourrat, and T. N. Nguyen. Random walk in random environment, corrector equation and homogenized coefficients: from theory to numerics, back and forth. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 35(2):499–545, 2015.
[20] A. Gloria. Numerical approximation of effective coefficients in stochastic homogenization of discrete elliptic equations. *ESAIM Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 46(1):1–38, 2012.
[21] A. Gloria and J.-C. Mourrat. Spectral measure and approximation of homogenized coefficients. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 154(1-2):287–326, 2012.
[22] A. Gloria and J.-C. Mourrat. Quantitative version of the Kipnis-Varadhan theorem and Monte Carlo approximation of homogenized coefficients. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 23(4):1544–1583, 2013.
[23] A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, and F. Otto. Quantification of ergodicity in stochastic homogenization: optimal bounds via spectral gap on Glauber dynamics. *Invent. Math.*, 199(2):455–515, 2015.
[24] A. Gloria, S. Neukamm, and F. Otto. A regularity theory for random elliptic operators, preprint, arXiv:1409.2678.
[25] A. Gloria and F. Otto. An optimal variance estimate in stochastic homogenization of discrete elliptic equations. *Ann. Probab.*, 39(3):779–856, 2011.
[26] A. Gloria and F. Otto. An optimal error estimate in stochastic homogenization of discrete elliptic equations. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 22(1):1–28, 2012.
[27] A. Gloria and F. Otto. The corrector in stochastic homogenization: optimal rates, stochastic integrability, and fluctuations, preprint, arXiv:1510.08290.
[28] T. Y. Hou and X.-H. Wu. A multiscale finite element method for elliptic problems in composite materials and porous media. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 134(1):169–189, 1997.
[29] T. Y. Hou, X.-H. Wu, and Z. Cai. Convergence of a multiscale finite element method for elliptic problems with rapidly oscillating coefficients. *Math. Comp.*, 68(227):913–943, 1999.
[30] B. D. Hughes. Conduction and diffusion in percolating systems. In *Encyclopedia of complexity and systems science*, pages 1395–1424. Springer, 2009.
[31] A. A. Járai and A. Nachmias. Electrical resistance of the low dimensional critical branching random walk. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 331(1):67–109, 2014.
[32] H. Kesten. Subdiffusive behavior of random walk on a random cluster. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 22(4):425–487, 1986.
[33] S. M. Kozlov. Geometric aspects of averaging. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 44(2(266)):79–120, 1989.
[34] G. Kozma and A. Nachmias. The Alexander-Orbach conjecture holds in high dimensions. *Invent. Math.*, 178(3):635–654, 2009.
[35] T. Kumagai. *Random walks on disordered media and their scaling limits*, volume 2101 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, 2014. Lecture notes from the 40th Probability Summer School held in Saint-Flour, 2010.
[36] C. Le Bris and F. Legoll. Examples of computational approaches to accommodate randomness in elliptic PDEs, preprint, arXiv:1604.05061.
[37] D. Marahrens and F. Otto. Annealed estimates on the Green function. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 163(3-4):527–573, 2015.

[38] J. C. Maxwell. Medium in which small spheres are uniformly disseminated. *A treatise on electricity and magnetism*, part II, chapter IX, article 314. Clarendon Press, 3d ed., 1891.
[39] J.-C. Mourrat. Variance decay for functionals of the environment viewed by the particle. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.*, 47(1):294–327, 2011.
[40] J.-C. Mourrat. First-order expansion of homogenized coefficients under Bernoulli perturbations. *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)*, 103(1):68–101, 2015.
[41] G. C. Papanicolaou. Diffusion in random media. In *Surveys in applied mathematics, Vol. 1*, volume 1 of *Surveys Appl. Math.*, pages 205–253. Plenum, New York, 1995.
[42] A. Quarteroni, R. Sacco, and F. Saleri. *Numerical mathematics*, volume 37 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
[43] J. W. Strutt, 3d Baron Rayleigh. On the influence of obstacles arranged in rectangular order upon the properties of a medium. *Philos. mag.*, 34(211):481–502, 1892.
[44] X. Yue and W. E. The local microscale problem in the multiscale modeling of strongly heterogeneous media: effects of boundary conditions and cell size. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 222(2):556–572, 2007.

(J.-C. Mourrat) Ecole normale supérieure de Lyon, CNRS, Lyon, France
E-mail address: jean-christophe.mourrat@ens-lyon.fr